

# Countywide Community Forums: Transportation -- Public Priorities, Choices, and Funding (generic)

Countywide Community Forums is a network of periodic public forums where people gather in small groups throughout King County to discuss current issues and provide feedback to county government and other public officials. The program is run by volunteers, overseen by the King County Auditor's Office and uses techniques and software developed by the Forum Foundation. For more information on the Countywide Community Forums, check [www.metrokc.gov/auditor/CCF](http://www.metrokc.gov/auditor/CCF). The data included in this report was generated from 114 forums organized between June 28 and July 20, 2008.

This Fast Forum® report is copyright © 2008 by the Forum Foundation.

Fast Forum®, PLAN Forum®, Opinionnaire®, and Newspaper® are all registered trademarks of the Forum Foundation, United States Patent Office. PC Rating™, QUEST Forum™, MPC Rating™ and Family Forum™ are all trademarks with patents pending.

---

The Forum Foundation Disclaimer clause: *The purpose of these informal reports is to communicate ideas, issues, and problems among people as a platform for future, meaningful discussions of concerns. Participants are assisted in becoming aware of their own beliefs as well as of those intellectual and moral beliefs of others at a point in time--the Zeitgeist. The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the individuals who participated and do not necessarily represent the official views of the parent group or sponsoring organization. Nor will the views expressed necessarily represent those of the same participants at a later period of time; as humans, we each have the ability to receive new information, consider it, and change.*

\*Legend: Example of a Polarization-Consensus Rating for yes/no questions

## PC Rating™

"Polarization Rating" (75% -- 80) "Consensus Rating"

<p>A measure of the WEIGHT given an idea or question by the people participating. The polarization rating is the percentage of people participating who answered yes or no (excluding those who abstained or objected.)</p>	<p>A measure of the OPINION given by those people answering yes or no. The consensus rating is the percentage of people answering yes of those who answered yes or no, i.e. The % positive response (excluding those who abstained or objected.)</p>
<p>Thus: A polarization rating of 100% means everyone participating answered yes or no. A rating of 50% means half answered yes or no. A rating of 0% means no one answered yes or no (thus, everyone abstained or objected.)</p>	<p>Thus: A consensus rating above 50 means the people answering favored the idea--up to 100 which means unanimously favorable. A rating below 50 means they were against the idea, down to zero which means they were unanimously against it (thus no one answered yes.</p>

Read the PC Rating™ cited above as "75% had 80 consensus" meaning: 75% of those persons participating were polarized and answered either yes or no. Therefore, of those persons who answered yes or no, 80 out of 100 answered yes (thus 20 out of 100 answered no). The PC Rating™, therefore, allows accurate and easy comparison of responses between different-sized

groups and also total responses.

For further insights on the kinds of questions people feel able to answer within a grouping of related questions, questions can be ranked and reordered by the Polarization Rating showing the weight. That is, both yes/no and multiple-choice questions can be ranked and reordered by the percentage of people who answered the question with clear yes/no or multiple-choice responses--excluding those who abstained or objected. This magnifies the analysis of the data to better resolve the social attitudes of those who participated, i.e., "Social Resolving Power."

\*Legend: Modified Polarization-Consensus Rating (MPC Rating™) for value-scale questions: (1) Strongly Agree and Agree are converted to Yes; (2) Neutral/Undecided is not converted to Abstain (i.e., Neutral affects the Polarization rating but does not affect the Consensus rating); (3) Disagree and Strongly Disagree are converted to No, and all are then calculated as an MPC Rating™.

---

## Project Value-Statement Questions

1) (T-1) Which **one** choice best describes all of King County's current transportation system overall (roads, transit, ferries, HOV ("diamond") lanes, bridges, bike lanes & trails, sidewalks, walking paths, etc.)?

- (1) Excellent
- (2) Good
- (3) Fair or Average
- (4) Poor
- (5) Very Poor

### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	1%	14%	46%	27%	8%	3%	1%	Total	N/A

2) (T-2) What do you believe is the **single** biggest issue facing with King County's current transportation system?

- (1) Lack of convenient access to transportation options such as mass transit, bike lanes, sidewalks, and trails.
- (2) Traffic congestion
- (3) Pollution and climate impact (air, water, greenhouse gasses, etc.)
- (4) The safety and vulnerability of our roads, bridges, and highways in case of earthquakes, windstorms, or due to inadequate maintenance.
- (5) Other

### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	23%	49%	5%	5%	12%	3%	2%	Total	N/A

3) (T-3) Which **one** transportation-related improvement do you think would most improve the transportation system in King County?

- (1) Adding more capacity or routes to public transit (bus and rail)
  - (2) Adding more general purpose freeway or highway lanes
- (3) Changing land use codes to encourage higher population densities and alternatives to traveling by car
  - (4) Taxing congestion with variable tolls
  - (5) Other

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	36%	21%	10%	7%	15%	6%	5%	Total	N/A

4) (T-4) In your opinion, government should spend the majority of its non-operations and maintenance transportation resources in support of:

- (1) Single occupant vehicles
- (2) Equally between (a) the road network available to single occupant vehicles, and (b) the transit and non-transit alternatives to single occupant vehicles
  - (3) Transit alternatives to single occupant vehicles
- (4) Non-transit alternatives to single occupant vehicles (such as carpools, vanpools, bike paths, sidewalks, and trails)
  - (5) Other

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	13%	32%	34%	6%	8%	4%	3%	Total	N/A

5) (T-5) To what extent does traffic congestion in King County negatively impact you personally?

- Big Impact (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) No Impact

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	14%	25%	28%	23%	7%	1%	1%	Total	( 98% - 56%)

**6) (T-6) To what extent do you believe that traffic congestion in King County negatively impacts our businesses, industries, and economy?**

- Big Impact (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) No Impact

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	42%	35%	14%	3%	2%	3%	1%	Total	( 96% - 94%)

**7) (T-7) To what extent are you satisfied or unsatisfied with the current level of transit service in King County?**

- Very Satisfied (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Very Unsatisfied

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	2%	9%	30%	34%	18%	6%	1%	Total	( 93% - 18%)

**8) (T-8) To what extent do you believe that the current level of transit service in King County negatively impacts our businesses, industries, and economy?**

- Big Impact (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) No Impact

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	15%	31%	24%	15%	5%	7%	3%	Total	( 90% - 71%)

**9) (T-9) Please indicate your #1 priority here:**

- (1) Add transit services (Bus and/or Rail)
- (2) Add general-purpose lanes to existing freeways & highways
- (3) Add HOV or HOV/HOT lanes to existing freeways & highways
  - (4) Build more bicycle/walking paths
  - (5) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	47%	26%	6%	4%	13%	2%	3%	Total	N/A

**10) (T-10) Please indicate your #2 priority here:**

- (1) Add transit services (Bus and/or Rail)
- (2) Add general-purpose lanes to existing freeways & highways
- (3) Add HOV or HOV/HOT lanes to existing freeways & highways
  - (4) Build more bicycle/walking paths
  - (5) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	23%	17%	27%	15%	10%	5%	3%	Total	N/A

## 11) (T-11) Please indicate your #3 priority here:

- (1) Add transit services (Bus and/or Rail)
- (2) Add general-purpose lanes to existing freeways & highways
- (3) Add HOV or HOV/HOT lanes to existing freeways & highways
  - (4) Build more bicycle/walking paths
  - (5) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	14%	12%	25%	17%	18%	11%	3%	Total	N/A

12) (T-12) In general, if a congested freeway or highway such as the Alaskan Way Viaduct or the SR-520 ("Evergreen Point") bridge needs to be replaced by federal, state, or county agencies for structural reasons, how much capacity should its replacement have?

- (1) Capacity for single occupancy vehicles should be increased, for example from three lanes to four lanes
- (2) Capacity should be increased, but only to add multiple occupancy vehicles (bus, bus rapid transit, rail, carpools or vanpools) or HOT lanes
  - (3) Capacity should remain the same
- (4) Capacity should be reduced, for example from four lanes to three lanes
  - (5) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	31%	42%	6%	3%	10%	4%	4%	Total	N/A

13) (T-13) What should be the most important priority for the allocation of additional transit services? They should be allocated:

- (1) To the routes that require the least subsidy.
- (2) By a formula that builds ridership in the suburbs like the current 40:40:20 formula.
- (3) To meet the needs of transit-dependent people who have no other mobility options.

- (4) Based on total population and proximity to employment centers.
- (5) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	12%	19%	18%	30%	6%	11%	4%	Total	N/A

14) (T-14) What is the single best way to encourage more people to use transit?

- (1) Eliminate or substantially reduce fares.
- (2) Increase the scope of service to more areas.
- (3) Increase the frequency, speed, and reliability of service by building rail and/or BRT.
  - (4) Offer more "off-peak" service.
  - (5) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	8%	26%	41%	5%	12%	4%	4%	Total	N/A

15) (T-15) Should King County and cities within King County attempt to reduce traffic congestion by adopting policies that are intended to increase the availability of affordable housing inside King County's largest cities (where most people work), and also near Transit Centers and major Park & Ride lots?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	60%	28%	8%	4%	Total	( 88% - 68%)



16) (T-16) Should King County and cities within King County attempt to reduce traffic congestion by adopting land use planning policies that are intended to increase residential population densities and create mixed use, walkable, and transit friendly neighborhoods in urban and suburban areas?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	68%	24%	6%	2%	Total	( 92% - 74%)

17) (T-17) Should King County and cities within King County encourage more commercial development and retail services in or immediately adjacent to major Transit Centers and Park & Ride lots to give people using these facilities another option to using their cars to access shopping, dining, and entertainment?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	83%	11%	4%	2%	Total	( 93% - 88%)

18) (T-18) Should King County use more of its transportation funding to encourage more carpooling even if it meant less money for other programs?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	34%	51%	11%	4%	Total	( 85% - 40%)

19) (T-19) Should King County use more of its transportation funding to encourage more vanpooling even if it meant less money for other programs?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	48%	38%	11%	4%	Total	( 86% - 56%)

20) (T-20) What is your opinion about the role large employers should play in assisting with congestion relief in King County?

- (1) Most large employers should do more to encourage their employees to carpool, bike, or walk to work.
- (2) A few large employers are doing a good job and should continue their efforts to reduce traffic congestion.
- (3) Most large employers are doing a good job and should continue their efforts to reduce traffic congestion.
- (4) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	43%	18%	16%	14%	7%	2%	Total	N/A

21) (T-21) Would you like to see more **passenger-only ferry service on Puget Sound?**

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (3) I want to see what happens with the current demonstration projects before deciding.

### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	40%	11%	39%	9%	1%	Total	N/A

22) (T-22) Would you like to see more **passenger-only ferry service routes on Lake Washington** (such as service from Kirkland to the University of Washington)?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (3) I want to see what happens with the current demonstration projects before deciding.

### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	42%	13%	35%	9%	1%	Total	N/A

23) (T-23) Should King County use more of its transportation funding to better coordinate bus service with state and local ferry service?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	63%	18%	16%	3%	Total	( 81% - 78%)

24) (T-24) Replacing the Alaskan Way Viaduct, replacing the SR-520 ("Evergreen Point") bridge, widening I-405 or SR-167, expanding Light Rail or creating a Bus Rapid Transit system may all require billions of dollars in local funding. **What source would you like to see used to raise the majority of local funds for these kinds of projects?**

- (1) Gas taxes (can ONLY be used for roads per state constitution)
  - (2) Car tab taxes
  - (3) Sales taxes
- (4) Tolls on new or upgraded freeways or highways
- (5) Tolls on existing freeways during the most congested times

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	14%	9%	4%	28%	19%	12%	13%	Total	N/A

25) (T-25) What is your opinion of HOT lanes?

- (1) I support HOT lanes
- (2) I oppose HOT lanes
- (3) I want to see what happens with the test of HOT lanes on SR-167 before deciding.

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	28%	22%	44%	4%	2%	Total	N/A

26) (T-26) Convert more HOV lanes to "HOT" lanes where the HOV lanes are underused?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	62%	24%	11%	2%	Total	( 87% - 72%)

27) (T-27) Build new "HOT" lanes where the HOV lanes are already at full capacity?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	38%	47%	12%	3%	Total	( 85% - 44%)

28) (T-28) Set the minimum speed that toll-paying solo drivers may access the HOT lanes to:

- (1) 55 miles per hour
- (2) 50 miles per hour
- (3) 45 miles per hour (current minimum speed)
- (4) 40 miles per hour
- (5) 35 miles per hour

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	18%	12%	23%	3%	3%	31%	10%	Total	N/A

29) (T-29) What is your general opinion of variable tolls?

- (1) I support variable tolls
- (2) I oppose variable tolls

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	51%	38%	9%	3%	Total	( 88% - 57%)

30) (T-30) If variable tolls were to be tested, which option would you support?

- (1) TESTING variable tolls on the replacement for the SR-520 ("Evergreen Point") bridge after it's built.
- (2) TESTING variable tolls on the current SR-520 bridge and/or the current I-90 bridge.
  - (3) TESTING variable tolls on I-5 through downtown Seattle and/or
  - (4) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	23%	30%	14%	13%	11%	9%	Total	N/A

31) (T-31) Do you think Sound Transit should ask voters to approve additional local sales taxes to extend Light Rail:

- South from SeaTac/Airport to South 200th Street?
  - (1) Yes
  - (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	33%	48%	15%	4%	Total	( 81% - 41%)

32) (T-32) Do you think Sound Transit should ask voters to approve additional local sales taxes to extend Light Rail:

- **Farther South to Highline Community College?**

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	36%	45%	16%	4%	Total	( 81% - 44%)

33) (T-33) Do you think Sound Transit should ask voters to approve additional local sales taxes to extend Light Rail:

- **North from the University of Washington to Northgate?**

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	61%	28%	9%	3%	Total	( 88% - 69%)

34) (T-34) Do you think Sound Transit should ask voters to approve additional local sales taxes to extend Light Rail:

- **East from Seattle to Mercer Island and Bellevue via I-90?**

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	50%	38%	9%	3%	Total	( 87% - 57%)

35) (T-35) Do you think Sound Transit should ask voters to approve additional local sales taxes to extend Light Rail:

- **Farther east to Redmond's Overlake Transit Center?**

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	45%	41%	11%	4%	Total	( 85% - 52%)

36) (T-36) In May the Sound Transit Board sought public input on transit expansion options, including whether to move forward with a ballot measure in 2008 or wait until 2010. Arguments for 2008 include the fact that by waiting two years, inflation would increase the cost of a package by approximately \$1 billion, and waiting would delay access to expanded services in response to rising congestion, gas prices and environmental concerns. Arguments for waiting include views that Sound Transit should not ask voters to fund a further expansion of its Light Rail system until after the first route opens in 2009, so that voters have a chance to use it before voting again. **What is your opinion?**

- (1) Sound Transit should seek voter approval this November.
  - (2) Sound Transit should wait until 2010.
  - (3) I don't live in the Sound Transit voting area.



**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	44%	33%	7%	9%	7%	Total	N/A

37) (T-37) Based on what you know today, how do you think you will vote if Sound Transit puts a transit expansion proposal along the lines described above on the November 2008 ballot? (Please abstain if you are not eligible to vote or don't live in the Sound Transit voting area.)

- (1) Definitely Yes
- (2) Probably Yes
- (3) Undecided
- (4) Probably No
- (5) Definitely No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	20%	18%	10%	14%	23%	14%	1%	Total	N/A

38) (T-38) Some people have argued that Light Rail works best where population densities are greatest (for example, between Downtown Seattle, the University of Washington and Northgate), and that Bus Rapid Transit ("BRT") is the better form of mass transit for East King County, where densities are lower outside of the urban centers. **What form of transit do you think makes most sense for connecting the major population centers of East King County?**

- (1) Light Rail
- (2) Bus Rapid Transit
- (3) A combination of Light Rail along I-405 and Bus Rapid Transit east of I-405.
- (4) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	12%	35%	35%	7%	9%	2%	Total	N/A

39) (T-39) Proposition 1, last November's proposal for a combination of "Roads & Transit" improvements, was supported by both the Regional Transit Improvement District (RTID) and Sound Transit. Voters rejected Proposition 1, 44%-56%. **What are your thoughts now that the election is over?**

- (1) An integrated roads and transit measure was a good idea and the measure was generally appropriate in scale.
- (2) Integrating roads and transit was a good idea, but the package should have been smaller.
- (3) Integrating roads and transit was a good idea, but the package should have been larger.
- (4) Integrating roads and transit was not a good idea -- voters should have considered roads and transit measures separately.
- (5) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	10%	10%	5%	52%	11%	11%	2%	Total	N/A

40) (P-1) What topic would you MOST like to discuss in future *Countywide Community Forums*?

- (1) A specific transportation proposal, such as how best to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct or how best to replace the SR-520 ("Evergreen Point") bridge.
- (2) Taxes, services, and budget priorities in King County.
- (3) Education in King County.
- (4) Public Safety & the Justice System in King County.
- (5) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	28%	35%	12%	9%	10%	6%	1%	Total	N/A

41) (P-2) If the next round of the *Countywide Community Forums* did address a specific transportation proposal, what one specific topic would you most like to discuss?

- (1) The Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement
- (2) The SR-520 ("Evergreen Point") bridge replacement
  - (3) Expanding our Road System
- (4) Expanding King County's Metro Bus Service
  - (5) Other

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	27%	14%	16%	24%	11%	7%	1%	Total	N/A

42) (P-3) Have you every testified at a King County public hearing or Town Hall meeting?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	22%	71%	6%	0%	Total	( 94% - 24%)

43) (P-4) *Countywide Community Forums* are small group meetings hosted by citizen

councilors, where you watch a short video summary of the topic, discuss the topic informally, and then respond to a detailed survey. **Public Hearings** are larger meetings where you watch live testimony by public officials, experts and other citizens, and where you can request the opportunity to testify personally. **Town Hall meetings** are informal public meetings where everybody in a community is invited to attend, voice their opinions, and hear the responses from public figures and elected officials. **Which type of meeting do you prefer?**

- (1) Countywide Community Forums
  - (2) Public Hearings
  - (3) Town Hall meetings
  - (4) Other

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	62%	5%	15%	6%	11%	1%	Total	N/A

44) (P-5) In your opinion, what would be the **single** best way for King County to get more, high-quality public input into King County's transportation planning process?

- (1) King County should encourage more people to participate in the Countywide Community Forums.
- (2) King County should encourage more people to participate in Public Hearings and/or Town Hall meetings.
  - (3) King County should do random sample polls.
  - (4) King County should organize facilitate focus groups.
  - (5) Other

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	54%	12%	6%	8%	11%	8%	1%	Total	N/A

45) (P-6) How do you rate the information presented in the "**Orientation**" video?

- (1) Excellent

- (2) Good
- (3) Fair or Average
  - (4) Poor
  - (5) Very Poor

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	15%	46%	23%	2%	1%	12%	0%	Total	N/A

46) (P-7) How do you rate the information presented in the **"Transportation" video?**

- (1) Excellent
- (2) Good
- (3) Fair or Average
  - (4) Poor
  - (5) Very Poor

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	8%	41%	34%	8%	1%	9%	0%	Total	N/A

47) (P-8) In general, do you think the "Transportation" video was **fair and even-handed?**

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

**TOTAL**

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	63%	20%	16%	2%	Total	( 82% - 76%)

48) (P-9) How well did the questions in this *Opinionnaire*® address the topic of "Transportation in King County?"

- (1) All major issues were covered.
- (2) Most major issues were covered.
- (3) Most major issues were not covered.
- (4) None of the major issues were covered.
- (5) Other

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	12%	64%	6%	4%	4%	7%	1%	Total	N/A

49) (P-10) How did you first hear about the *Countywide Community Forums*?

- (1) Newspaper article
- (2) Radio program or advertisement
- (3) Handout at Dick's Drive-In Restaurants
- (4) Meeting Presentation or word of mouth
- (5) Other

#### TOTAL

TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™
549	15%	5%	9%	38%	29%	5%	0%	Total	N/A

50) (P-11) Did you think the time you needed to devote to answering this detailed *Opinionnaire*® has been:

- (1) About right
- (2) Too long (you want fewer questions next time)
- (3) Too short (you want more questions next time)
- (4) Other

TOTAL									
TOTAL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	ABSTAIN	OBJECT	CATEGORY	MPC RATING™	
549	62%	26%	3%	3%	5%	1%	Total	N/A	

## About the Fast Forum® Technique and The Forum Foundation

### Trailer Clause:

The Fast Forum® technique enables interested persons to more effectively and meaningfully communicate their individual opinions. By summarizing these opinions in written reports, the Fast Forum® technique communicates to participants the values in which they believe. This important information can then be communicated simultaneously to parent, teacher, school, religious, business, community, and government organizations, i.e., "the established leadership." The Fast Forum® technique is a product of the Forum Foundation and based on the research of its founder, Dr. Richard J. Spady. The Forum Foundation in Seattle, Washington, is a non-profit, educational, and research corporation dedicated to strengthening democratic processes through improved feedback communication. The Forum Foundation firmly believes that by improving feedback communication in this manner, society can reduce apathy, improve community well-being, and address better the problems and opportunities we all face together.

### Philosophy:

A creative organization or society actively searches for visionary solutions to its problems. The open exchange and discussion of ideas through Zeitgeist Communication technology is the mortar that can bind organizations and society together during this creative process. This exchange, in turn, leads naturally toward improved decision-making, consensus, and spontaneous collaboration. *Any organization or society that inhibits the free movement of ideas among its members up, down, and across their organizational and societal structures (innocently or not) is depriving itself of its greatest resource — human thought. Such an organization or society is in grave danger of being buried in history by the avalanche of the creativity of others.*

### Theory of Creativity:

"Symbolic Dialogue" among citizens and their leaders in all organizations, public and private through Many-To-Many Communication technology (whether in nations, states, counties, cities, schools, organizations, or places of worship), is similar to the creative processes of the Socratic Method. *Administrative and civilization theories, as perceived by the people, are the "social algorithms" and "social architecture" that create the future for the human race.*

### Certification Clause:

Tabulation of the data contained in this report by the Forum Foundation, for its part in the process, is certified correct barring unintentional errors.

\*\* For further information refer to this book: [The Leadership of Civilization Building: Administrative and Civilization Theory, Symbolic Dialogue, and Citizen Skills for the 21st Century](#) (Spady, Kirby,

and Bell, 2002, ISBN 0-9700534-9-5). For additional information about the research, services, or grants of the Forum Foundation, e-mail [FastForum@mac.com](mailto:FastForum@mac.com) or visit the website at <http://ForumFoundation.org>.

**The Fast Forum® Computer Program is copyright © U.C.C. 1990-2008 by the Forum Foundation. All rights reserved.**